



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/731,405	12/10/2003	Tadashi Mori	031320	3914
23850	7590	11/08/2005	EXAMINER	
ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS, HANSON & BROOKS, LLP 1725 K STREET, NW SUITE 1000 WASHINGTON, DC 20006			ENGLE, PATRICIA LYNN	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		3612		
DATE MAILED: 11/08/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/731,405	MORI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Patricia L. Engle	3612	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 May 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 26 May 2005 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 1-6 are objected to because of the following informalities: In claim 1, line 6, "a regulation" should be --the regulation--. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bauer (US Patent 5,209,316).

Regarding claim 1, Bauer discloses a cab supporting structure supporting a cab (16) against a vehicle frame (14), comprising: an attenuation mechanism (62) for supporting the cab against the vehicle frame; and a regulation member (10) for regulating a displacement in an extensional direction (44) of the attenuation mechanism; wherein the regulation member, only when a predetermined displacement is generated in the cab in the extension direction of the

attenuation mechanism, regulating the displacement (46 reaching the bottom of slot 44) is provided separately from this attenuation mechanism (62).

Regarding claim 2, Bauer discloses the cab supporting structure according to claim 1, wherein said regulation member (10) has a cab side member (20) attached to the cab side, and the cab side member (20) is in a non-interferential relation with said vehicle frame side (14) in a normal condition (Fig. 4).

Regarding claim 3, Bauer discloses the cab supporting structure according to claim 1 or claim 2, wherein said regulation member (10) regulates displacement of the cab before (via 52 and the top end of the slot) a stroke end of said attenuation mechanism (62).

Regarding claim 6, Bauer discloses the cab supporting structure according to claim 1 or 2, wherein, when rigidity of said cab is set to be larger at the rear side than at the front side, said regulation member is provided at least at the rear side of the cab (Fig. 1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out

Art Unit: 3612

the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bauer in view of Applicant's Admission (Figs. 17 and 20).

Bauer discloses the cab supporting structure according to claim 1 or 2. Bauer does not disclose that there is an operation machine. The Applicant's admit in Figs. 17 and 20 that a cab supporting structure with an operation machine and the attenuation device taught by Bauer is known (Fig. 20). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the regulation member as taught by Bauer in a cab structure with an operation machine as taught by the Applicant's admission in Fig. 20.

8. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bauer in view of Keechner et al. (US Patent 5,388,884).

Regarding claim 4, Bauer discloses the cab supporting structure according to claim 1 or 2. Bauer does not disclose that the regulation member (10) is arranged between a column of the cab (16) and the vehicle frame (14). Keechner et al. disclose a cab supporting structure with the regulation member arranged between a column (24) and the vehicle frame. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to mount the regulation member between the column of the cab and the vehicle frame. The motivation would have been to best support the vehicle cab.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed September 23, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The Applicant argues that the element 10 of Bauer does not regulate the element 62. The Examiner contends that the element 10 would prevent, and therefore regulate, the element 62 from extending beyond the point where the bearing 46 reaches the bottom of slot 44.

Conclusion


10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patricia L. Engle whose telephone number is (571) 272-6660. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8:00 to 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, D. Glenn Dayoan can be reached on (571) 272-6659. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Patricia L Engle
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3612

ple
November 2, 2005